



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,406	12/31/2003	Sven Schwerin-Wenzel	103580.00023/2002P10173US	4672
54975	7590	09/30/2010		
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 10 ST. JAMES AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02116-3889			EXAMINER CHUMPTIAZ, BOB R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/30/2010 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/750,406	Applicant(s) SCHWERIN-WENZEL ET AL.
Examiner BOB CHUMPITAZ	Art Unit 3629

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/B. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Traci L Casler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Lineberry and Marpe combination discloses the claimed limitations as noted in the Final Office Action submitted on 7/12/2010. First, for clarification purposes the Examiner cites to the common definitions of the claim elements: "Metadata" and "Markup Language" at the time of the invention was made. Metadata (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021201224451/http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/M/metadata.html>): Data about data. Metadata describes how and when and by whom a particular set of data was collected, and how the data is formatted. Metadata is essential for understanding information stored in data warehouses. Markup Language (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021208053022/http://www.wdvl.com/Authoring/HTML/>): It is a non-proprietary format, based upon SGML, for describing the structure of hypermedia documents - plain text (ASCII) files with embedded codes for logical markup, using tags like <A> and to structure text into tables, hypertext links interactive forms, headings, paragraphs, lists, and more. It can be created and processed in a wide range of tools from simple plain text editors to sophisticated WYSIWYG (What You See Is What You Get) authoring tools. The citations noted above address the discrepancies noted in Applicant's argument regarding the patent application priority date. The Examiner is not taking Official Notice for the noted definitions above, it's a noted by the Examiner for clarification purposes only. Second, Lineberry discloses a computer program comprising a code segment that displays information through an HTML document downloaded by the server system (Claim 54: HyperText Markup Language). Additionally, Lineberry discloses the communication means for connecting source systems ([0016, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 42-45, 78]) and a main user interface with the function to ([0051, 54-65]). Lastly, Marpe teaches the process of formatting information from one platform to another ([0080 markup language]) and the process for querying a database upon selection of an associated identifier of one of the data items being located ([0256]). Furthermore, Marpe teaches wherein navigation chevrons are employed to navigate data within any type of database ([0137]). In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In conclusion the Examiner maintains the previous rejection noted on the Final Office Action (7/12/2010).